



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL
OF
SEMITIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES
(CONTINUING "HEBRAICA")

VOLUME XVIII

JANUARY, 1902

NUMBER 2

IS THE BOOK OF AMOS POST-EXILIC?

BY EDWARD DAY AND WALTER H. CHAPIN,
Springfield, Mass.

"Amos is one of the most marvelous and incomprehensible figures in the history of the human mind, the pioneer of a process of evolution from which a new epoch of humanity dates." So says Carl Heinrich Cornill in his little volume, *The Prophets of Israel*.¹ He is far from being alone in his estimate of the man and his work. To Canon Cheyne, Amos is "a surprising phenomenon."² This eminent Old Testament student even goes so far as to declare: "Altogether the book of Amos is a literary as well as prophetic phenomenon."² George Adam Smith enthusiastically asserts: "The book of Amos opens one of the greatest stages in the religious development of mankind. Its originality is due to a few simple ideas, which it propels into religion with an almost unrelieved abruptness."³ Other scholars have spoken well-nigh as unguardedly. The mighty chasm over which we must leap as we pass from the JE narratives and the comparatively sterile literature of the Deuteronomists to the first of the literary prophets, at the head of whom Amos is supposed to stand, though the book is far from being the least mature in thought and style, is enough to excuse those who hold to this work as belonging to the eighth century B. C. for speaking thus extravagantly. One of the writers of this paper has himself to confess

¹ Corkran's translation, p. 46. Cf. p. 45 of the same; also Cornill's words on Amos in his *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*.

² *Encyclopædia Biblica*, Vol. I, col. 158.

³ *The Book of the Twelve Prophets*, Vol. I, p. 73.

that in a recent volume, while still retaining the old view of the early date of these prophets, he was moved to speak of their lofty ethical conceptions as unexplainable.⁴ In the effort to account in part for Amos, the question has been asked in all seriousness by those who have themselves attempted to answer it: "How could such a plain countryman have been possessed of such a refined and yet vigorous style?"⁵ We do well to ask this. For a cultured city-dweller such work in the eighth century would have been marvelous; much more was it for one occupying the position Amos is supposed to have occupied, and living where he is supposed to have lived. Such "alertness of intellect," such "striking culture and refinement of style," such "width of knowledge," might be expected among the great men of the post-exilic time. We have these characteristics in Deutero-Isaiah, as we have them in Job and in certain of the most sublime of the Psalms, but in the pre-exilic time and among simple countrymen they seem singularly out of place. It relieves us but little to be told that Amos had often driven his miserable sheep north, or that he had carried his wool thither. Such as he probably did neither. Nor does it greatly aid us in the solution of this most perplexing problem to call attention to the width of the outlook from Tekoa, or to suggest that it was near a great caravan route. All this may partially explain the fulness and sturdy strength of the man's discourse; but it leaves unexplained his cultivated style and his profound ethical and religious conceptions. Amos still remains to us "a surprising phenomenon."

Has not the time come when it is possible for us to put this little prophetic book where it belongs? If it is found that it was written in the post-exilic period, it may at the same time be discovered that other supposed pre-exilic prophets must be carried over with it. Such a transfer may render it necessary for us to do much of our Old Testament work over again, as it surely must necessitate a readjustment of much of our supposed knowledge of Israel and Judah; but if it accords with actual facts, it will not be so difficult. The ease with which many of us have come to accept the Psalter as a post-exilic hymn-book, none of whose compositions belongs to the pre-exilic time, has been owing to the

⁴ *The Social Life of the Hebrews*, pp. 109 sq.

⁵ Cheyne, *Encyclopædia Biblica*, Vol. I, col. 155; see also W. R. Smith, *Prophets of Israel*, pp. 125 sqq.; Driver, "Joel and Amos" (*Cambridge Bible*), pp. 103, 106 sq.; G. A. Smith, *Book of the Twelve Prophets*, Vol. I, pp. 79 sqq.

correspondence of such a position with the facts we have had daily to face. Much has been cleared up that was unexplainable from the old point of view. So here: Amos and Hosea, and perhaps certain other of the prophets as they find their proper places, will be as easily explainable as is the book of Jonah; but, while such books will cease to be surprising phenomena, they will lose not a whit of their literary merit, nor will they part with any least portion of their lofty ethical and religious character.

We have in passing noted that at the head of the literary, or writing, prophets whose work has been partially preserved, scholars have long put Amos of Tekoa. It is true that the book which bears his name does not stand first among the Twelve Prophets, commonly known as the Minor Prophets. Both Hosea and Joel precede Amos, in the Hebrew text as in our English, though Hosea has long been regarded as a late cotemporary of Amos, while Joel has, with growing unanimity, been considered by able critical students of late years a post-exilic prophet, one of the last of the group in which his book has been numbered. The evidence which has led to putting Amos at the head of the literary prophets has been thought to be conclusive. It is of two kinds: the supposed references to the man in the title and in the text, and the internal character of his writings as they have heretofore been understood.

As to the title and biographical parts, a few things need to be said. The title manifestly and admittedly is post-exilic.⁶ At best it simply records a tradition of the post-exilic period, some three centuries subsequent to the time when the said prophet is thought to have lived. The book of the Twelve Prophets, in the form in which it has come down to us, is post-exilic. This is now widely recognized; and it cannot be too emphatically asserted. Not only are many of its separate parts now known to have been written in the centuries subsequent to the exile, but all is known to have been, or thought to have been, subjected to editorial revision and supplementation at a late day. Just now the tendency is to multiply late glosses and insertions, to find them everywhere. Perhaps the time has come to call a halt in work of this kind.⁷ However this may be, we accept the thought of the book

⁶ See articles "Amos" in *Encyclopædia Biblica* and *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible*.

⁷ This tendency to discover late glosses and insertions is unfortunate for the contention so strenuously made by most critical students that most of these prophets are early and that several are pre-exilic. Every discovery of a late gloss weakens their contention.

in its present form as post-exilic. The titles of all these prophetic books should be sharply scrutinized by the student of Jewish prophecy. When a book bears indubitable internal marks of an ancient origin, a title which gives it a date which corresponds with its internal character may presumably, as a tradition, be considered trustworthy; but we must ever hold ourselves ready to set aside the title and to revise our conclusions if later study reveals that the individual prophecies that make up the book bear the marks of another period than the generally received one. For example, to go outside of the Twelve Prophets, we who have accepted the conclusions of Dr. Cheyne as to the post-exilic character of much of Isaiah, chaps. 1-39, that was once thought to be entirely pre-exilic, in his *English Polychrome* text, rather than in the more conservative notes of the same volume, must feel that the time is surely coming when the first Isaiah will be found to have been a late Babylonian or Judean cotemporary of Deutero-Isaiah; or rather that the book as a whole was a post-exilic thesaurus of much of the best prophetic thought of the time. If such time ever comes, the title, having been utterly discredited by the internal evidence, will then be thrown aside as useless lumber that was tossed on top of the magnificent building long subsequent to its completion; unless, indeed, the title be regarded as evidence of the post-exilic writer's wish to locate his work in a certain past time. The same must be true of the title of Amos, or of any other of the Twelve Prophets. Such a title stands or falls as it corresponds with, or contradicts, the character of the actual oracles or discourses.

In the case of Amos we have, it is true, a supposed biographical passage (7:10-17) and certain allusions to the man himself in various parts of the text. Much has been made of these, for they have not been seriously questioned. Unfortunately for those who contend that they are reliable, and therefore conclusive, they are not reinforced by allusions to Amos in the historical books of the time. Jonah of Amittai appears in the history as a prophet; but of Amos there is no mention.⁸ No slightest trace have we of this remarkable personage who is thought to have figured so wondrously in the development of the life and thought of Israel. The strange story of a prophet who went north in the days of

⁸ The same, curiously enough, is true of Isaiah, Jeremiah, etc. The first mention of Amos, outside his book, is in the Apocrypha.

Jeroboam I. and cried against the altar of Bethel⁹ is now supposed to have been written in the post-exilic time, and to have been suggested by the experience of Amos as given in his book.¹⁰ A careful study of the biographical section of Amos reveals the fact that it is wanting in vividness and reality. That it is brief and unsatisfactory has been noted by critical scholars; that it is strangely inserted between descriptions of visions to which it has no apparent relation has also been recognized. Its evident want of reality has been explained by recalling the fact that the book as we have it is manifestly post-exilic. The editor is supposed to be speaking here.¹¹ In a disconnected and fragmentary way he tells the story of Amos's experience, putting words which seem to him appropriate in the mouths of the actors in the Bethel incident, which has to our minds occupied so conspicuous a place in Israelitish history, and has so strangely woven itself into our thought of Israel's development.

Amaziah, of whom nothing is known outside of this narrative, and who is probably a purely imaginary personage suggested to the Judean writer by the high-priest of his day in Jerusalem, appears as the chief priest of Bethel, here mentioned as a royal sanctuary. Our knowledge of whether it was this in the days of Jeroboam II. seems to depend very largely upon this narrative. The said Amaziah interrupts Amos, it would appear, while he is speaking of visions vouchsafed him. These visions as given are literary compositions, which, as Dr. Cheyne very reasonably thinks, were never spoken.¹² What Amos is declared to have said is given as an oracle that has but a remote relation to the visions. The charge of conspiracy, which Amaziah makes as he sends a messenger to the king, appears to be unwarranted if the prophet's conduct is to be judged by his words as reported; for the mere prediction that Jeroboam was to die by the sword and that Israel was to go into captivity was

⁹ 1 Kings 13:1 *sqq.*

¹⁰ That the reverse may have been true we are inclined to believe. This curious chapter, upon which the law and the prophets of Israel seem very largely to hang, may have been written by the author of the story of the promulgation of the Deuteronomic laws in the time of Josiah, a story as fictitious as the story of the promulgation of the priestly laws by Ezra.

¹¹ This is true of but a part of our critical scholars. Most of them appear to hold to the biographical section as substantially the work of Amos. Many would not, it is probable, go so far as to admit with Canon Cheyne that the book was edited in the post-exilic time, though they find in it minor glosses and considerable insertions.

¹² *Encyclopædia Biblica*, Vol. I, cols. 154, 156.

not treasonable. The unrealistic character of the incident as reported ought to be transparently clear to an unbiased mind. As evident is the mechanical nature of the conversation. We give it herewith :

AMAZIAH: O thou seer, go, get thee into the land of Judah, and there eat bread, and there prophesy; but prophesy no more against Bethel; for it is the king's sanctuary, and it is a royal house.

AMOS: I am not a prophet, nor am I the son of a prophet; but I am a herdman, and a dresser of sycamores. And Yahweh took me from following the flock, and Yahweh said unto me, Go, prophesy against my people Israel. Now therefore hear thou the word of Yahweh. Thou sayest, Prophecy not against Israel, and drop not [word] against the house of Isaac. Therefore thus saith Yahweh, Thy wife shall be a harlot in the city; and thy sons and thy daughters shall fall by the sword, and thy land shall be resurveyed; and thou thyself shalt die in an unclean land, and Israel shall surely be led away captive out of his land.¹³

By our translation we have purposely made the colloquy as vivid as the original will permit; but we do well to inquire, after we have done so, if we have here the narrative of an actual incident, or even a late story of such an incident. It bears the marks of some literary art, as, for example, the use of the phrase "the house of Isaac" to avoid the repetition of "Israel" in the same sentence; but it lacks the note of reality. If Bethel was what it is represented to have been, the great sanctuary of a great king, and if Amaziah was the head of this royal sanctuary, what more improbable than that such a priest would let such a man as Amos thunder on while a messenger was dispatched to the king! Had he done this, would he have ordered Amos home? There is sarcasm, it is true, on the part of Amaziah; but was this the only weapon within reach of this mighty priest? And what may be said of the reasons put in the mouth of Amaziah as he argues with this rustic? Such as he are not wont to reason thus, if at all, with a poor shepherd. Amos, however, does not appear in any more striking light. He tells Amaziah, forsooth, that he is not a prophet. Were the prophets whom we meet in the early chronicles, though never perhaps to be confounded with political enthusiasts or men who made a living by smooth speech, wont to thus speak of themselves? Amos is said to have declared of

¹³ חזה, vs. 12; מקדש, vs. 13, and ישחק, vs. 16, appear to be late. As a phrase ברת ישחק is late, while אדמה טמאה, vs. 17, is specially characteristic of the Holiness Code, which we consider much later than the date usually assigned to it, 573 B. C.

himself that he was a herdman and a dresser of sycamores, though how he cared for sycamores while living in Tekoa has never been satisfactorily explained, for the sycamore grows not in the vicinity. Provided he was all this, what need had he to speak of it, or to allude, as he did according to the story, to a call on the part of Yahweh? His reported recapitulation of Amaziah's charge can be explained as a piece of literature, not otherwise. The words are those of one who did not want to put in Amos's mouth what had already been said. The prediction as to the wife of Amaziah is too explicit for an actual oracle, and too far aside from the mighty issues Amos is supposed to have faced. Prophets were not wont to predict thus explicitly the fate of individuals. They might speak of them as falling by the sword when they had in mind their perishing in actual warfare. Nor were they accustomed to speak of prominent ladies who were not known to them, or who were known only by hearsay, as setting up as harlots. So, too, as regards Amaziah himself, the oracle is too explicit. Only on the supposition that Amos was possessed of a degree of prescience which we today are unwilling to ascribe to the prophets of those times can such a prediction be considered as other than incredible. We must conclude that this biographical section is untrustworthy as furnishing data concerning this supposititious man, Amos. With it must go all other mention of Amos in the text. Of the internal character of the various oracles as evidence of the time when they were uttered or written, we shall later have something to say. There are other and preliminary considerations that now demand our thought. We must note carefully the portions of this book that at the present time are regarded by our great critical scholars as post-exilic.

That a considerable portion of the book of Amos is now thought by critical students of the Old Testament to be late is significant. Slowly but surely this hypothetical post-exilic editor is swallowing the original Amos. The seriously suspected passages and those which in the opinion of many are indubitably late constitute a considerable part of the book. Over a fifth, to say nothing of minor glosses, is thus set aside as unoriginal. The magnitude of these rejected passages when brought together is noteworthy. Parts of these are supposed to be later than the Deuteronomists; other parts are thought to be later than Jeremiah and Joel; while parts are classed with the late post-exilic

literature because they are found to bear a close resemblance to Psalms, or to P, and other writings of the time, as Job.¹⁴

Passing by the title, which, as we have seen, must be rejected for the reasons named and, we may add, because it bears linguistic marks of a time considerably posterior to the supposed date of Amos,¹⁵ we may note passages thought to be late, which have for this reason been cut out of the text. Singularly enough, we are forced to begin with 1:2, which Taylor, Cheyne, and others reject:

And he said,

Yahweh from Zion shall roar,
And from Jerusalem he shall give his voice;
And the pastures of the shepherds shall mourn;
And the top of Carmel shall wither.

This, we are told, is ill adapted for an opening verse. The mention of Zion is thought to be out of place; while the elegiac tone of the latter part of the verse appears to be out of harmony with the cycle of stern oracles which follow.¹⁶ It has its affinities with Jeremiah (25:30), but is even more manifestly an echo of Joel.¹⁷ The fact that Zion is elsewhere (6:1) alluded to may be similarly explained; while the mention of a lion in another place (3:8) as roaring, and the reference to the top of Carmel in another place (9:3), are supposed to have influenced the editor, who had probably made some slight study of Amos.¹⁸ That vs. 2 was prefixed by the post-exilic editor is explained by saying: "It was to assure the post-exilic readers of Amos that the threats of the prophet had long since been fulfilled and that restored Zion should be safe under the care of its lion-like divine protector." It certainly must, as Dr. Cheyne says, be connected in thought with 9:8-15; for with it as a part of the text of Amos it stands or falls. Though failing to find in the reasons given evidence of its never having been a part of the original Amos, we may, for

¹⁴ See article "Amos" in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, and that in the Cheyne and Black *Encyclopædia Biblica*. See also Driver, *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, 8th edition.

¹⁵ נִקְרָא is late and uncommon as compared with רָעָה. רָעָה appears to be late as compared with רָאָה. It has affinities with the Aramaic קָוָה; it is found but seldom earlier than the prophets, if at all, but is common in the Psalms and Job.

¹⁶ *Encyclopædia Biblica*, Vol. I, col. 153.

¹⁷ Amos 1:2a appears to have been borrowed from Joel 3:16a (4:16a); while 1:2b has close affinities to Joel and other post-exilic prophecies.

¹⁸ *Encyclopædia Biblica*, Vol. I, col. 151.

the reasons mentioned and because of certain linguistic marks, safely declare that it is post-exilic.¹⁹

The next rejected passage is the oracle against Tyre, 1:9, 10, which Cheyne and Wellhausen both consider late:

Thus saith Yahweh,

For three transgressions of Tyre, yea, for four,
I will not bring them [him] back;
Because they delivered up the whole captivity to Edom;
And remembered not the covenant of brethren:
Therefore I will send fire upon the wall of Tyre;
And it shall devour her palaces.

The translation of לֹא אֶשְׁיבֵנָהּ, "I will not bring them back," here in Amos 1:9 and in the other oracles, demands special attention, because it has not heretofore been offered and because it has a vital place in our thought of Amos as a post-exilic unity which finds a natural and unavoidable culmination in Amos 9:8-15. Our reasons for so rendering it may be simply stated as follows:

1. This translation gives the ordinary sense of the words; it is in no way forced or strained.

2. The theme of the chapter is exile, and in vss. 5 and 15 we have גִּלְגָּל as the antithesis of הָשִׁיב.

3. In other places the pronominal ending הוּ used with הָשִׁיב always refers, as is characteristic of pronominal endings, to some expressed person or thing.

4. When הָשִׁיב means "to turn away," a preposition (מִן) is used or a noun, as פָּנִי.

5. The notion that the surrounding nations might be recalled from captivity is elsewhere plainly expressed. See Jer. 48:47, of Moab; 49:6, of Ammon; 49:39, of Elam; Ezek. 16:53, 55, of Sodom (probably Edom) and Samaria; and 29:13, 14, of Egypt.

6. This translation makes it evident that the threats in chaps. 1 and 2, and the denunciation in chaps. 3-8, are the dark background on which the artist paints the picture of restoration in

¹⁹ See *Encyclopædia Biblica*, Vol. I, col. 151. The term "Zion" (צִיּוֹן) appears to be late. Evidence for its early use is poor. It is found in 2 Sam. 5:7 in a doubtful passage, part of which is unquestionably late. See Budde, *Samuel*, *SBOT.*, Heb., p. 32. It occurs also in 1 Kings 8:1, which is imbedded in a passage which Driver declares has been expanded. Its use there is not, however, more open to question than in 2 Kings 19:21, 31. אֲבֵל, as metaphorically used, is late; see Joel 1:10. נֶאֱדָר is late; see Joel 1:19, 20; 2:22; Ps. 23:2; etc. Amos 1:2b should be compared with such passages as Jer. 23:10; 25:37; Isa. 33:9, and Nahum 1:4 all of which belong to a day long subsequent to the fall of Samaria.

chap. 9, which is the logical termination of the book for which all the remainder was written.

This oracle is rejected²⁰ because it differs so slightly from 1:6 *sqq.*, having "Tyre" where that has "Gaza," and having but one clause which it has not: "and remembered not the covenant of brethren;" and because Tyre only is named, while in the preceding oracle the great cities of the Philistines are all named. As a whole, then, the oracle is thought to be a weak imitation of the preceding. That Amos should have thus repeated himself is considered incredible. We may dismiss all this as trivial; but when questions are raised as to whether the early Israelitish prophets knew anything about such an act as is imputed to Tyre in vs. 9, and as to what the phrase "the covenant of brethren" can have meant in the mouth of Amos, we have to admit that the oracle has the appearance of being post-exilic. It is doubtful if there was opportunity for such a people as the Phœnicians, even had they been so disposed, to get the better of Israel before they were weakened by the Assyrians. That the Phœnicians are thought of as getting the advantage of Israel in a raid, or in some such way, seems evident from the writer's rather vague statement concerning the delivering up of the whole captivity²¹ to Edom and their failure to remember the brotherly covenant. We are told that in the seventh century the Phœnicians took sides with Assyria against their sister-cities; even later than this they probably manifested a like spirit, for it was centuries before the Phœnicians ceased to be able to assert themselves in western Asia.²² Though there appear to be no words peculiar to this oracle that are late, there are words and phrases which it has in common with other oracles that should not be overlooked as marks of a late date.

The oracle against Edom is closely connected with the one against Tyre which we have been considering. Those who reject the first reject the second; though there are some who do not suspect the first, who either suspect or reject the second:²³

²⁰ *Encyclopædia Biblica*, Vol. I, col. 151. Cf. Wellhausen, "Die kleinen Propheten" (*Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, III), p. 69; and G. A. Smith, *The Book of the Twelve Prophets*, Vol. I, pp. 126 *sqq.* While Dr. Smith does not reject this oracle, he fails to account for it.

²¹ Possibly returned exiles are meant. The term גִּלְגָּל is invariably late, and is used of those who have been brought back from exile.

²² Driver, "Joel and Amos" (*Cambridge Bible*), pp. 137 *sq.* Cf. Isa., chap. 23; Jer. 25:22; Ezek., chaps. 26-28; Zech. 9:3 *sq.*; who all, as Driver says, "foretell the ruin of Tyre; but it was long before it was accomplished."

²³ See G. A. Smith and Driver, *in loc.* The former suspects it; the latter admits that there may have been occasion for it in the days of Amos, though he finds none.

Thus saith Yahweh,

For three transgressions of Edom, yea, for four,
I will not bring them back;
Because he pursued his brother with the sword;
And corrupted his pity; and kept his anger forever,
And his wrath he ever retained.
And I will send fire upon Teman;
And it shall devour the palaces of Bozrah.

The reasons for putting this oracle with the rejected pieces are convincing. Edom up to the time of the exile suffered at the hands of Judah; never was it, so far as we know, in those centuries in a position to avenge itself; but later it harried the Negeb and dispossessed many of the Jews, partly because they were themselves being crowded out of their fatherland by the Nabateans, and partly because the weakened Jewish people gave them an opportunity to erase old scores. Besides, as Wellhausen has shown, Teman and Bozrah belong naturally in the post-exilic literature, while they are out of place in an eighth-century oracle.²⁴ In Gen. 36:33 Bozrah is mentioned; but, while the passage in which it occurs has been assigned to J, it is reasonable to suppose that the mention of Bozrah is late, inasmuch as most of the chapter belongs to P and is therefore late.

With singular unanimity our critical scholars reject the oracle against Judah, 2:4, 5. Wellhausen, Duhm, Oort, Stade, Cheyne, G. A. Smith, and Taylor may be named among those who do not believe it to be pre-exilic. While wanting in explicitness, it yet has in the main the usual form:

Thus saith Yahweh,

For three transgressions of Judah, yea, for four,
I will not bring them back;
Because they despised the law of Yahweh;
And kept not his statutes;
And their idols caused them to err;²⁵
After which their fathers walked.
Therefore I will send fire against Judah;
And it shall devour the palaces of Jerusalem.

Amos, it has been thought, was absorbed in his mission to north Israel;²⁶ he could not have turned aside to Judah; every

²⁴ See Wellhausen, *in loc.* As open to question as pre-exilic is נִצַּח, common in the Psalms and Job, but rarely, if ever, found in the early literature.

²⁵ Literally, "their fabrications," *i. e.*, their "idols" or "images."

²⁶ Cheyne, *Encyclopædia Biblica*, Vol. I, col. 153.

reference to Judah must be late. Then, too, this oracle is vague, contrasting strangely with the usual pungency of style of the prophet; moreover, we are told, it weakens the climax in which Israel figures.²⁷ All this is unconvincing; but when we are reminded that it sounds like an echo of Deuteronomy, we are brought face to face with the real reason for considering it late. Instead, therefore, of putting it a century before the days of the Deuteronomists, we must place it in a period considerably subsequent thereto.²⁸ But why, forsooth, did the post-exilic editor insert this oracle? "Because he felt the need of a distinct reference to the sin and punishment of Judah?"²⁹ Though we fail to discover sufficient reason for tearing this oracle out of its place, we must admit that it bears the marks of post-exilic authorship.

The doxologies are among the rejected parts of Amos. Wellhausen, Duhm, Stade, Cheyne, and Taylor reject the first, 4:13:

For behold! He that formeth the mountains, and
createth the wind,
And declareth to man his thought;
Who maketh dawn and darkness, and walketh upon
the high places of the earth,
Yahweh, Elohim of Hosts, his name.

In the sublimity of its thought, especially in its conception of Yahweh, this is post-exilic. It has affinities with certain passages in Deutero-Isaiah, the Psalms, and Job. Here, as in the case of the other doxologies, we feel with Kuenen the force of W. R. Smith's argument for their retention as a part of Amos; with him also we recognize the fact of their frequency in the later literature. We are glad the dilemma in which he puts us is one of his own making, that it does not exist in fact.³⁰

With the doxology just considered critical scholars are agreed to reject also, and for similar reasons, 5:8, 9:

He that maketh the Cluster and the Fool,
He that turneth the shadow of death into morning,
And maketh the day dark with night;
That calleth for the water of the sea

²⁷ Wellhausen, *Die kleinen Propheten*, p. 71.

²⁸ Not only are חורר, חק, and שמר characteristic of the Deuteronomists, but מואס, a late word, though not found in Deuteronomy, is in its tone Deuteronomic.

²⁹ Cheyne, *Encyclopædia Biblica*, Vol. I, col. 153.

³⁰ *Onderzoek*, II, 71, 6. Cf. Cheyne, *Encyclopædia Biblica*, Vol. I, col. 153. Among linguistic marks of a late date may be named שח. Though the verb is old, the noun appears to be late. ברא is a late P word. עיפה is found only here and in Job.

And poureth it out upon the face of the earth;
 Yahweh, his name:
 That causeth destruction to break forth upon the strong,
 So that ruin cometh upon the fortress.

The linguistic reasons for considering this passage late are fully as strong as the preceding; they are to be taken as reinforcing those which have to do with the general character of the doxology.³¹

Chap. 9:5, 6 belongs to the doxologies:

And Adhonay Yahweh of Hosts is he that toucheth
 the earth and it melteth,
 And all the inhabitants thereof languish;
 And it riseth up wholly as the Nile,
 And as the river of Egypt it subsides.
 He buildeth in the heavens his chambers;
 And foundeth his vault upon the earth;
 He calleth for the waters of the sea,
 And poureth them out upon the face of the earth:
 Yahweh, his name.

Possessed of the same general character, this doxology bears evident marks of lateness.³² If the other doxologies are late, this also must be. It is, moreover, thought to be unconnected with the context; though this, it should be remarked, is claimed of all the doxologies. It seems to us that too much has been made of this want of consecution in thought and grammatical construction. Fragments of this sort may be thrown in by the author of such a book almost anywhere. We sympathize with W. R. Smith, who held that, while these doxologies are not closely connected with the movement of the prophet's thought, they are in substantial agreement with the scope of it, as may be seen in 4:7 *sqq.*; 7:1, 4; 9:3.³³ So, too, Kuenen, as we have seen, though he noted their frequency in the late literature, could not, for similar reasons, bring himself to tear these doxologies out of Amos. If these pieces are pre-exilic, then we cannot cease to marvel over them, for there is absolutely nothing with which they may be compared in the early time. They must stand by themselves in solitary grandeur and sublimity, presenting as they do a conception of

³¹ Cf. Job 9:9; 38:31 for the names of the constellations mentioned. They are late, כימה being an old name for Pleiades, and כסיל for Orion. צלמות is late; it is found frequently in the Psalms and Job. So also are שד and בלג late.

³² אנדה and יסד should be specially noted.

³³ *Prophets of Israel*, 2d ed., pp. 399 *sq.*

Yahweh which, though it may be wanting in mercy and compassion, is yet worthy of Deutero-Isaiah and Job.³⁴

We pass over 5:14, 15, which, though Wellhausen rejects it, is generally accepted as a part of the original Amos. It certainly belongs to the text. Only on the supposition that Amos is late can this be assigned to the post-exilic time. It is different with the verse to which we now turn. The weight of scholarship seems to be against it. In 5:26 we have this curious passage, quite different from anything else in the book; and a passage the perplexity of which has but recently vanished. It alludes unmistakably to a worship of the gods of the conquerors on the part of Israel:

But ye bore Saccuth, your king, and Kaiwan,
Images of the star of your gods which ye made for
yourselves.³⁵

Saccuth and Kaiwan are now known to have been Babylonian deities. It is quite likely that apostate Israelites did carry images of these gods in procession during and after the exile; but it is as certainly probable that they did not prior to that time.

Still further we may note that we have in Amos 6:2 a passage which has so grown in disfavor that it is now widely rejected:

Pass ye unto Calneh, and see;
Go thence to Great Hamath;
And go down to Gath of the Philistines:
Are they any better than these kingdoms?
Or is their border any greater than your border?³⁶

The fact that Calneh, a Syrian city, was conquered by Tiglath-Pileser III. in 738, and Hamath by Sargon in 720, and Gath by the same in 711, is conclusive, in the thought of critical scholars, for the late date of this passage, which seems to them singularly out of place. That it has not the rhythm of 6:1 and 6:3-7 we admit, though we are not aware that it is safe to attempt to make much of this fact.

It seems to us incredible, as we may later try to show, that 8:5, 6 should be considered pre-exilic; but so few are disposed to question the genuineness of this passage that we may pass over

³⁴ Cf. Isa. 40:22; 42:5; 44:24; 45:18; Job 9:8, 9.

³⁵ *Encyclopædia Biblica*, Vol. I, cols. 153 sq.

³⁶ The force of the words seems to be this: Those places have fallen into the hands of Assyria; how can Israel hope to escape? It is true, then, that there was an Israel that was in danger in post-exilic time.

it at this time. Vs. 8 of the same chapter should be rejected if 9:5 is thrown out; but some eminent scholars are inclined to reject the latter while retaining the former. In the case of 8:11, 12, 13 there is greater disposition to agree, and especially as regards the first two verses. We give the whole passage:

Behold the days are coming, saith Adhonay Yahweh,
When I will send a famine upon the land,
Not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water,
But a famine of hearing the words of Yahweh.
And they shall wander from sea to sea, and from north to east,
And they shall run to and fro to seek the word of Yahweh and
they shall not find.
In that day the fair virgins and the young men shall faint for thirst.

Upon general grounds these words are rejected. They bear the marks of a time long subsequent to Amos.³⁷

The longest rejected passage is the last, the concluding section of the book. It strikes in the main a note that is absent from earlier parts of Amos. On the whole it is optimistic, and contains unmistakable assurances of a restored state and an era of great prosperity. Traces of Joel and of other late writers are found. It has been surmised that a post-exilic editor cut away the original close of the book and put this prophetic piece of his own in its place in order to suggest that the threats contained in the book had been fulfilled:

Behold the eyes of Adhonay Yahweh are upon the sinful kingdom,
And I will destroy it from off the face of the ground,
Save that I will not utterly destroy the house of Jacob, saith Yahweh.
For behold, I am commanding, and I will sift among all nations the
house of Israel,
As corn is sifted in a sieve, yet not a grain shall fall to the ground.
With the sword all the sinners of my people shall die,
Who say, The evil shall not overtake nor anticipate us.

We have here given but the first part of this rejected portion of chap. 9, vss. 8-10. It has generally been supposed that vs. 7 could not have closed the book. Accepting the passage given above as a part of the addition made to the text in post-exilic

³⁷ והשלחתי רעב בארץ לא-רעב ללחם ולא-צמא למים כי אם-לשמע את דברי יהוה vs. 11, is characteristic of the late time. So, too, is רעב בארץ לא-רעב ללחם ולא-צמא למים כי אם-לשמע את דברי יהוה. They knew something of a famine of bread as they knew something of a thirst for water in the pre-exilic time; but they did not know, nor did they speak, of a famine of hearing the word of Yahweh. שורץ, vs. 12, is late in the *pölel*; the *kal* is found in Numb. 11:8, which is supposed to be a part of JE.

times, scholars have recognized as reasonable Dr. Torrey's suggestion as to the close. He retains vss. 8*a* and 10, so that following upon vs. 7 he reads vss. 8*a* and 10 :

Behold the eyes of Adhonay Yahweh are upon the sinful kingdom,
And I will destroy it from off the face of the ground.
With the sword all the sinners of my people shall die,
Who say, The evil shall not overtake nor anticipate us.³⁸

Such a close is terrific ; but, on the supposition that Amos is a pre-exilic prophet of doom, it seems eminently fitting.

We resume our translation of the closing part of this chapter :

On that day I will raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen,
And I will close up the breaches thereof,
And I will raise up his ruins,
And I will build it as in the days of old ;
That they may possess the remnant of Edom ;
And all the nations upon whom my name is called,
Saith Yahweh who doeth it.
Behold the days are coming, saith Yahweh,
When the plowman shall overtake the reaper,
And he that treadeth grapes him that soweth the seed ;
And the mountains shall drop wine, and all the hills shall melt.
And I will cause to cease the captivity of my people, Israel ;
And they shall build the waste cities, and they shall dwell therein ;
And they shall plant vineyards and shall drink of their wine,
And they shall make gardens and they shall eat of their fruit ;
And I will plant them upon their land ;
And they shall no more be rooted up from their land,
Which I have given them, saith Yahweh thy Elohim.

Throughout this passage we are struck with the affinities in thought and expression with the literature of the Chaldæan and Persian periods, as Dr. Cheyne and others have pointed out.³⁹ The dependence of the writer upon Joel, if not upon Leviticus, is also noticeable. Linguistically the passage has many marks of a late date. Passing over such phrases as "the sinful kingdom" and "the sinners of my people," which we, in common with Dr. Torrey, must consider a part of the original Amos, though we also, as against him, must consider them as evidencing the

³⁸ *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1896, pp. 153 sq.

³⁹ *Encyclopædia Biblica*, Vol. I, col. 153; Driver, "Joel and Amos" (*Cambridge Bible*), p. 122.

lateness of the book as a whole, we shall note the marks of a late date from vs. 11 on to the close of the chapter.⁴⁰

We shall have to conclude that the passages which we have considered must be post-exilic. The evidence for a late date, where it depends upon the relation of the suspected passage to the context, or to other portions of the book which are unsuspected, may be inconclusive; but where it reveals dependence upon post-exilic literature, or marked affinities in language and in thought with such literature, it cannot be ignored. Such study as we have given to these rejected passages has led to the conviction that the critical scholars are right in assigning them as they do to a time considerably subsequent to the exile. These passages can never again be regarded as other than post-exilic. But what shall we say of the remainder of Amos? Must we hold to an original, embracing some four-fifths of the book, as pre-exilic? To do so is not necessarily to hold that it belongs to the days of Jeroboam II. Dr. Taylor, in *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible* (Vol. I, p. 86), admits that there are those who for reasons which seem good to them try to bring down the date of Amos as a whole considerably. "An attempt has recently been made, on the ground of internal evidence, to bring it down a quarter of a century, and to date it about 734 B. C." Evidently the rejected passages are not the only ones which are giving our scholars trouble. Many apparently are coming to feel that parts of Amos that they have accepted as pre-exilic must be later than the date usually assigned to the book, about 760 B. C.

After all, the so-called original Amos must be studied by itself independently and fearlessly. If a critical study of it reveals marks of a date posterior to the exile that are well-nigh,

⁴⁰ דרר, vs. 11, which occurs in 6:5, an unrejected passage, is late for דרר. דרר appears not to be earlier than the prophets. כרמי עולם is a late phrase. Cf. Mic. 7:14; Joel 2:2, and Mal. 3:4. למען יירשו, vs. 12, is Deuteronomistic. The conception of a remnant (שאר) is late; much more so, a remnant of Edom. Isa. 49:26, and Cant. 8:2. הגוים אשר נקרא שמי, vs. 13, is late, though found in Amos 4:2. ונגש חורש בקוצר and the immediately following phrases are dependent upon Lev. 26:5, as the last of them reflects Joel 3:18 (4:18). עסוס as a word for wine is late, occurring only here and in Joel 1:5; 3:18 (4:18); Isa. 49:26, and Cant. 8:2. מוג, found here and in Amos 9:5, a rejected passage, is apparently late, as it is elsewhere when metaphorically used. שבות, vs. 14, is late. Here the writer is speaking of a captivity which has taken place. Driver mentions also ("Joel and Amos," *Cambridge Bible*, p. 122) הריסה, which he puts alongside the word as found in Isa. 49:19. He, moreover, names ערים נשמות, vs. 14, as a late phrase, comparing it with its use in Isa. 54:3. Of שבות, vs. 14, he very truly remarks, it is "used at any rate mostly of the restoration from Babylonian exile." He further notes the consolatory way in which אלהיה, vs. 15, occurs as in the manner of Deutero-Isaiah in Isa. 41:10; 52:7; 54:6; 66:9.

if not quite, as conclusive as the marks of such date found in rejected passages, then we must date Amos as we do Jonah, accepting it as the work of a post-exilic writer who had his reasons for putting his words in the mouth of a supposititious man who was thought of by him as living in the days of Jeroboam II. and as interested primarily and chiefly in north Israel, though not wholly so, because his own thought was turned largely in that direction. Such a theory may enable us to read back into the text of our prophet most, if not all, of the passages which have been read out of it. We shall then have substantially a unity. The book may yet have its "holes," owing to the state of the text, and its abrupt transitions of thought as well as its unfortunate insertions, all, or nearly all perhaps, the work of the writer himself, whose work was in the nature of written literature rather than a collection of oracles which had actually been uttered. It is a noteworthy fact that Canon Cheyne has been led to conclude from his study of Amos that most of it was of a purely literary character. He thinks that the genuine oracles of the first two chapters were not spoken, that they were literary compositions akin to such pieces as are found in Isaiah. He also finds little, if anything, in chaps. 7-9, inclusive, that can have been spoken by Amos. The conclusion is an honest one that must appeal to many very strongly.

It is because of an independent examination of this book, following upon a most painstaking study of the social life of pre-exilic Israel, and more especially of their life as lived under the Deuteronomists, that the writers have been forced to conclude that the book of Amos is post-exilic. As they find no place for the Psalms, and cannot conceive of the people as known to us as having any use for them, in the centuries immediately preceding the exile, and as they find through a careful study of individual Psalms overwhelming evidence of a late date, so here everything about Amos points to a post-exilic writer who, because of reasons which must have been largely personal, saw fit to put his words in the mouth of one whom he conceived to be a pre-exilic prophet.⁴¹ In doing this he made some slight use of his imperfect knowledge of a time several centuries anterior to his own; but in language

⁴¹ The question of the pseudepigraphic character of the books of the Old Testament needs to be carefully investigated. We have well-known examples of such writing in the case of Samuel, and Ezra, and Daniel. We shall probably find that Hosea, Micah, Zephaniah, and other prophets are as truly pseudepigraphic. By dating back their works and

and thought he is so manifestly late that it is certain that many who have been carrying passage after passage of his writing over into the post-exilic time will have eventually to carry the entire work over into that age.

In a paper like this it is impossible for students to marshal all their data, or to convey to their readers all the evidence which has accumulated as they have studied most exhaustively, in the light of the best modern textual criticism, this fascinating book. It will be our aim to show that a study of the unsuspected passages of Amos leads to substantially the same conclusion that we reached through a study of the rejected passages. The writers will, of course, be reminded that different scholars have suspected many of the words, phrases, and clauses which they note as marks of lateness. We can only say in reply that it seemed best to gather together as rejected only those passages in which there is a consensus of opinion in favor of their rejection. Their conclusions do not by any means depend wholly upon small fragments of the book which have a post-exilic smell to individual students here and there.

We begin with the five oracles of chaps. 1 and 2 that remain. These have the same general form, differing but slightly in their mechanical structure from the rejected oracles. That these rejected oracles are less complete in their strophic form proves nothing as to their date; rather is it difficult to explain why a late oracle does not conform precisely in its strophic form with the supposedly early oracles.⁴² All begin with the words **כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה** ("thus saith Yahweh"),⁴³ which appear to be characteristic of the literary Israelitish oracular prophecy. Presumably it was a common phrase in oral discourse on the part of the earlier as well as the later prophets; but just here we cannot speak very confidently, because the early oracles which have been

giving them fictitious names, the writers of them expected to, and undoubtedly did, enhance their value to their readers. It would seem, in discussing the question, that the burden of proof is upon the defender of the title of any Hebrew book, rather than on one who assaults it, when we consider that it is now generally conceded that Moses had nothing to do with the Pentateuch, that there are no Davidic psalms, that Canticles and Proverbs are not from Solomon's hand or time, that Daniel is Maccabean, that two-thirds of Isaiah is not Isaianic, and that the apocrypha of the Old and New Testament are full of pseudepigraphs.

⁴² Cf. W. R. Harper, "Suggestions concerning the Original Text and Structure of Amos 1:3-2:5," *American Journal of Theology*, Vol. I, No. 1, pp. 140 sqq. See also, by same, *The Utterances of Amos Arranged Strophically*.

⁴³ In Exod. 4:22 it is late, probably P; in 5:1 it may be late E; while frequently elsewhere in Exodus it is found in J or JE, as 9:1, 13; 10:3, etc. In 1 Sam. 2:27 and 10:18 it probably is late E or D. See Budde, "Samuel," *SBOT.*, Hebrew text.

preserved appear to have been of a purely literary character. Nowhere have we early oracles that bear the marks of being transcripts of actually spoken discourse. Even the JE oracles seem to have been written, as literary pieces, several centuries after the time of the men who were said to have uttered them. In these, as in the oracles of the great literary prophets, the phrase mentioned above is to be found; but whether any of the oracular pieces are much older than the time of the Deuteronomists may be questioned. It is noteworthy that the nearest equivalent for the formula *על-שלשה פשעי ועל-ארבעה* ("for three transgressions . . . yea, for four") is found in a late book, Proverbs (30:15, 18, etc.). While it manifests no dependence upon Proverbs, it yet reveals a characteristic of the post-exilic literary art. *שוב* we have already considered. The word for palace, *ארמון*, in these oracles bears marks of a late date.⁴⁴ The common use of such words and phrases in these oracles, some of which are unmistakably late, if not post-exilic, is significant. Quite as suggestive is a study of the linguistic peculiarities of the individual oracles.⁴⁵ Many as appear to be the reasons for assigning the other four of these oracles to the post-exilic time, they are not stronger than those that have to do with the last, that against Israel, which is supposed to be early, if any of them are. We give it herewith entire :

Thus saith Yahweh,

For three transgressions of Israel, yea, for four,
I will not bring them back;
Because they sold for silver the righteous,
And the poor for a pair of sandals;
Who bruise the head of the poor,⁴⁶
And turn aside the way of the needy.
And a man and his father go in unto the same maid,
In order that they may profane the name of my holiness:
And upon pledged garments they stretch themselves beside
all altars;

⁴⁴ Though it is found in Micah, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Hosea, its use elsewhere is such as to lead us to think it post-exilic. See Ps. 48:3(4), etc.; Prov. 18:19; 2 Chron. 36:19; 1 Kings 16:18; 2 Kings 15:25. It may be no later than *היכל*, but it is unquestionably late.

⁴⁵ *הוריק*, 1:3, appears in Isa. 28:27 and 41:15 in the same sense. It is late. *יצת*, 1:14, is found in the late E parts of 2 Samuel (see 14:31, etc.); elsewhere in P and the prophets. *סער* and *סופה* are late. *שיר*, 2:1, appears only here and in Deut. 27:2, 4 and Isa. 33:12. The use of *קריה*, 2:2, for city in the pre-Deuteronomic literature is hardly an open question. See only 1 Kings 1:41, 45. It has its Aramaic equivalent. *שאון*, 2:2, seems to be no earlier than *סער*.

⁴⁶ This is according to Dr. Torrey, whose emendation of the text here is convincing. See the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1896, pp. 151 sq.

And wine of the amerced they drink in the house of
 their Elohim.
 Yet I destroyed the Amorite from before them,
 Whose height was as the height of cedars,
 And whose strength was as the oaks;
 And I will destroy his fruit from above and his root from
 beneath.
 I also brought you up out of the land of Egypt;
 And I caused you to walk forty years in the wilderness,
 To possess the land of the Amorites.
 And I raised up of your sons to be prophets,
 And of your young men to be Nazarites.
 Is not this so, house of Israel? saith Yahweh.
 Yet you caused your Nazarites to drink wine;
 And to your prophets you gave charge, saying, Prophecy not.
 Behold, I will press down upon you,
 As a cart full of sheaves presseth.
 Therefore flight shall perish from the swift;
 And the strong shall not augment his strength;
 And the man of might shall not deliver himself;
 And he that graspeth the bow shall not stand;
 And the swift of foot shall not escape;
 Neither shall he deliver himself that rideth upon horses.
 And he that is strong of heart among the mighty shall
 flee away naked in that day,
 Saith Yahweh.

The first few verses of this oracle are post-Deuteronomic; they even approach the Psalms in their general structure and tone. In the צדיקים ("righteous") who are sold for silver and in the אביונים ("poor") who are traded for sandals we find traces of the influence of the psalmists. Those who beat the poor upon the head were the coteremporaries of those who oppressed the poor in the days when the Proverbs and the Psalms were being written;⁴⁷ while to turn aside the needy in the gate was a common post-exilic offense.⁴⁸ The Deuteronomists legislated for the poor; but probably not until long after the exile did they as a class suffer almost habitual persecution. Even in the case of the Deuteronomists the interest in the poor was an interest awakened at least a century or more after the supposed date of Amos. The pledged garments and the wine obtained by fining referred to in vs. 8 likewise reflect post-exilic conditions. It is unsafe to argue from the internal character of Amos the state of society in the

⁴⁷ In Prov. 22:16; 28:3, etc., the Psalms, and Job we find in common use the same word for needy or poor as here, עָנִי.

⁴⁸ See Prov. 22:22; Job 5:4.

days of Jeroboam II. and then to reason that because a given oracle of Amos reveals such and such a state of society it must be an eighth-century oracle. We know little of that time except what this prophet is supposed to reveal; and he can hardly be used for this purpose. But it is not so much the social conditions that appear in the early part of this oracle as it is the use of terms that evidences to us its post-exilic character. Some of the words had already crystallized into the forms in which they appear in the Proverbs and the Psalms. The clause **לְמַעַן הָלַל אֶת־שֵׁם** **קִדְשִׁי** ("to profane the name of my holiness"), vs. 7, belongs to a post-exilic day when the name of Yahweh had come to have peculiar sacredness. The historical reminiscences of the remaining portion of the oracle, with all their misunderstandings of Israel's past, belong as surely to a period long subsequent to the eighth century. The influence of Deuteronomy is to be noted especially in the allusions to the Amorites. The references to north Israel in the post-exilic literature lead us to believe that the social conditions here depicted are substantially true to fact. We must accustom ourselves to the thought that the Assyrians in 722 B. C. did little more than break the resistance of the northern kingdom and bring the people into subjection. The time-immemorial quest for the lost ten tribes finds no excuse as historical diversion, for they were not lost. The deportation by the Assyrians could have been but partial at the most. The mass of the people seems to have remained,⁴⁹ as was the case in the south nearly a century and a half later, when Nebuchadrezzar crushed Judah. The social conditions depicted in Amos are those which existed for the most part in the north for four centuries or more after 722 B. C.

But if this be true of north Israel, and if such conditions as existed in some post-exilic time gave the writer of this late oracle occasion for his words, must not the same be true of the other rejected oracles? We do not know overmuch about these other peoples, especially Moab and Ammon; we therefore cannot speak very confidently; yet we do know that we have in Jeremiah a post-exilic oracle against Moab (chap. 48), as we have against Ammon (49:1, 2); as also we have in Ezekiel (25:2, etc.); and we recall the fact that in the days of Ezra there were those among the Jews who were not any too kindly disposed toward

⁴⁹ See Zech. 9:10, 13; 10:7; Pss. 60:7 (9); 78:9, 67; 80:2 (3); 108:8 (9); Ezek. 37:16, 19; 48:4, 5, 6. See also the apocrypha and other late literature.

their neighbors on the east. Had this not been so, the book of Ruth would never have been written. Though Damascus was among the first to suffer at the hand of Assyria, it was not wiped out.⁵⁰ In Jer., chap. 49, we find the prophet has a word to say about this city, though it had become feeble at the time. Indeed, the fact should be noticed that we have here in this chapter of Jeremiah apparently the original of this first of Amos's eight oracles, which was followed by him so nearly in his other seven oracles.⁵¹ We may then safely conclude that the oracle against Damascus should be put with the other post-exilic oracles. The same may be said of the remaining oracles. Even Driver admits that the power of the Philistines was not destroyed by Assyria and Babylonia, that its great cities were tributary to Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal in the fourth century, and that they are mentioned, not only in the time of Nehemiah, but also in the time of the Maccabees.

We may next consider chaps. 7-9, omitting such portions as have already received our attention. Here we have a series of visions which reveal a considerable degree of literary art, such indeed as to lead us to conclude, with Canon Cheyne, that they are written pieces which were never spoken. The writer appears almost to admit as much by the formula with which he begins his account of his visions: "Thus Yahweh Elohim showed me." The first is a vision of locusts at work devouring. It suggests the peril which Jacob was in at the time. The second is a vision of a fire licking up land and sea. It suggests similarly the danger which Jacob had to face. The third is a vision of Yahweh standing with a plumbline in hand, ready to demand rectitude of Israel and to punish them for all delinquencies. The fourth is that of a basket of summer fruit which quickly perishes. The end of Israel is at hand. The thought leads to prolonged discourse. It is noteworthy that in the first two visions, as they are described, Jacob is spoken of as small. Incomparably great as was Assyria at the time of the supposed date of Amos, it is doubtful if a prophet of that day would have pleaded the smallness of Jacob. Is this the north Israel of the time of Jeroboam

⁵⁰ Though it seems to have fallen into the hands of Tiglath-Pileser III. in 740 and to have remained very largely a dependency of Assyria until Nebuchadrezzar seized it, Syria is named as one of the conquests of Alexander in 333. That there were Israelites in Gilead to suffer at the hand of Damascus for centuries subsequent to the eighth we know.

⁵¹ Note especially the oracle against Damascus, vss. 23-27.

II., unless, indeed, his dominion was less than we have thought it? Is it not rather the Israel that had suffered at the hand of the Babylonians of the second empire, if not, indeed, at the hand of the Persians? It is, moreover, strange that the prophet should have pleaded the smallness of Israel as a reason why Yahweh should repent. The mention of the high places and sanctuaries need not lead us to date the third vision in a pre-Deuteronomic time. Anyone at all familiar with the life of the people under the Deuteronomists knows very well that their ideals were at the best but partially realized prior to the exile, and that a very unsavory state of things was existent in the north long after.⁵² Chap. 8:3 alludes to the songs of the temple **והילילו שירות** **היכל ביום ההוא** ("songs of the temple shall be wailings in that day"). **היכל** here is temple and not palace; as such it is late. It bears witness to a time when they had considerable of a ritualistic character in their worship at Jerusalem.⁵³ The new moon was kept as a feast undoubtedly in the early time; but its mention in 8:5, and even more the mention of the sabbath, strikes a distinctly post-exilic note; while the references to fraudulent weights and measures show the influence of Deuteronomy. The vision of 9:1 differs somewhat from the preceding; it is that of Yahweh standing beside some altar, not necessarily that of Bethel, and bidding someone, presumably the prophet, do an impossible thing: smite certain parts of the temple. Then follow words which seem like a reminiscence of the 139th psalm; though in this instance we may have in the prophet the original, albeit a late original. It is strongly post-exilic in tone. All this, together with the linguistic affinities which a minute study of the text reveals, leads us to conclude that we have in these chapters a post-exilic piece of prophetic literature. A careful comparison of the text with the text of the rejected passages leads us to believe that we have a substantial unity.⁵⁴ Even the biographical section (7:10-17) may have been loosely interjected by the author of

⁵² We may indeed raise the question whether the high places really gave way before the synagogues were planted in the post-exilic time. The synagogue, as better adapted to the needs of the people, may easily have won a battle which the Deuteronomists waged in vain.

⁵³ There are critical students who assert that there was as much ritual before the exile as after, but they undoubtedly go to the prophets for their data.

⁵⁴ As late we should note: **גז**, **גזב**, and **לקש**, 7:1; **סלח**, 7:2; **תהום**, 7:4; **אנד**, 7:7; **ישחק**, 7:9, 16; **מקדש**, 7:9, 13; **חרב**, meaning "to waste," 7:9; **חזה**, 7:12; **נטה**, 7:16; **טמא**: 7:17; **כלוב**, 8:1; **קייץ**, in the sense of summer fruit; **ילל**, 8:3; **פגר**, **עות**, 8:5; **מאזנים**, 8:5; **קרחה**, 8:10; **אשמה**, 8:14; **כפתור**, 9:1; **חתר**, 9:2; **נחש**, 9:3, of

the book to give his work the semblance of an eighth-century writing. Linguistically it appears to be a part of Amos. This can also be said of the closing part of chap. 9. Widely variant as it is in its general character, it yet in its words and phrases appears to be a part of the original book.⁵⁵ As we have remarked elsewhere, it appears to be the culmination of the writer's thought and the real occasion of his book. That it is linguistically not without resemblances to other parts of the book of Amos, even to the extent of its rarer words and phrases, should be noted as bearing directly upon the question of the unity of Amos as a whole.

Chaps. 3-6, inclusive, so far as these are thought to belong to the original Amos, remain to be considered. This section is of the nature of an expansion of the oracle against Israel, 2:6-16. In the main, what was said of that oracle as evidencing its post-exilic character must hold good of this. The sins denounced are of the same general character—impiety, lust, greed, oppression of the poor, cruelty, indifference to the public weal, forgetfulness of their glorious past, and actual enmity toward Yahweh and his servants. The social conditions depicted are then substantially

a sea serpent or dragon. As late, yet as found in other parts of Amos which have been considered post-exilic, we should note: **שָׁמַם**, 7:9, occurs in 9:14, a rejected passage; **חֹזֶה**, 7:12, found as a verb in 1:1, the rejected title; **אֲבִירִיךְ**, 8:6, found in 2:6; 4:1, etc.; **נִצַּח**, 8:7, found in 1:11, part of a late oracle; **נֶאֱדָר**, 8:7, found in 6:8, an accepted passage of the original Amos; **דָּרַךְ**, 8:14, as here used should be compared with its use in 4:10; **נִצַּב**, 9:1, found in 7:7, an accepted passage.

⁵⁵ We begin with vs. 8. At once we encounter **אֲדֹנֵי יְהוָה**, a characteristic term in Amos. Aside from this passage it occurs fifteen times, all in unrejected passages. **מַמְלָכָה**, vs. 8, is found in 6:2, a rejected passage, and also in 7:13, which has not been questioned. **הַטָּאָה**, vs. 8, is found in 5:12, not rejected, and in 9:10, rejected. **שֹׁמֵר** is found in 2:9, unrejected. **אֲדָמָה**, which as used is really a synonym of **אֶרֶץ**, is found frequently in unrejected passages. **אָפֶס** occurs in 6:10, an unquestioned passage. **בֵּית יַעֲקֹב** is found in 3:13, an unrejected passage; so, too, is **נָאֵם יְהוָה** found in unrejected passages. In vs. 9 we have **צָוָה**, which occurs also in 6:11; 9:3, 4, all unrejected passages; **נֹעַ** is found in 4:8; 8:12, the latter rejected; **נִיר**, here and in vs. 12, occurs also in 6:1, 14, unrejected; **בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל** is found in 5:1, 4, 25; 6:1, 14, all unrejected. In vs. 10 we have **בַּחֲרֹב**, which is in 1:11, a rejected passage, and in 7:9, 11, 17, and 9:14, unrejected. Little can be made of this because it is a common prophetic phrase. The same may be said of **עָמִי**, which is common to both parts of Amos. **רָעָה** should be compared with its use in Amos 6:3, an unrejected passage. **נָנֵשׁ** is found also in 6:3. In vs. 11 we have **בְּיָמֵם הַהוּא** **אֵיִם**, which should be compared with the same phrase in 2:16 and 8:3, 9, all unrejected, and also with 8:13, rejected; **דָּוִיד** occurs also as here in 6:5, unrejected; **קִים** is found in 2:11; 5:2, and 6:14, all unrejected; **פָּרִיץ**, in 4:3, unrejected. Vs. 12 has **שְׂאִירֵי תָאֵר**, which appears in 1:8, unrejected, and in 5:15, rejected; **יִרְשׁ**, which in 2:10 is retained as original; **אֲדָוָה**, in 1:6 and 2:1, is retained; in 1:9, 11, is rejected. The phrase in vs. 13, **יָמִים בָּאִים**, is found in 4:2, unrejected, and in 8:11, rejected. In vs. 14 we find **שֹׁמֵם**, which in 7:9 is unrejected; **נִטַּע כְּרִמִּים**, which in 5:11 is retained. So small is the book of Amos that we are not greatly surprised to find some of these more common words and phrases in unrejected parts; but others are so rare that their presence in such parts is well-nigh conclusive as evidence for the unity of the book. We need to remember that there is a change of theme, requiring in this closing portion a somewhat different vocabulary.

those alluded to in the oracle. Life is largely without restraint; society is disorganized; a strong central government seems to be wanting; the wealthy are living in irresponsible riot and lust and idleness. Even the wives of the wealthy, as was not the case in pre-exilic time, join their husbands in drunken carousal. Had they in this copied the Greeks of Alexander's day? The times were such as to widen the gulf between rich and poor; the chasm between wealth and want, luxury and poverty, had become such that the poor were in pitiable plight. In nature there seemed to be an attempt to vie with the disintegrating social forces. It is hardly to be supposed that famine and drought and pestilence can have so far intrenched upon the prosperity of the time of Jeroboam II., if his time was one of such unexampled prosperity as we have thought it, as to have received the prominence here given them. It is when society is disorganized, and men are not energetically at work to better their condition, that much attention is paid to physical calamities. The remedial agencies of a normal state are then wanting; recuperative power is not then possessed in sufficiency for actual needs. The excessive religiousness which we encounter in this section belongs to the later rather than to the earlier time, when everything was extravagantly and excessively done.

The pre-exilic society of north Israel was probably crude and coarse; but it could hardly have been utterly wanting in moral soundness. That kingdom fell, not because it was rotten socially, but because it was too small to resist successfully the might of the greatest world-power of the time. It was a part of Assyria's plan to bring such peoples into subjection. It is seriously to be questioned whether, had any such state of things existed in the pre-exilic time, any pre-exilic man of God would have understood it; or, if he had been able to look beneath the surface, would have thought it deserved the fate which befell it. Surely there is no cotemporary evidence that Assyria was the superior of Israel morally. The whole conception of the early time in Amos is retrospective, and faultily so. The elegy over the fallen virgin of Israel may have been based upon fragmentary and imperfect memories of what had been; but the real facts which stirred the mind of the writer must have lain much nearer home. The past may have partially furnished the molds into which, so far as the writer knew that past, he cast his thought. So confident are we

of the substantial accuracy of our thought here that we are content to leave these chapters with but these few general remarks and the linguistic notes that are appended.⁵⁶

We are aware of the fact that many of the words and phrases we have mentioned as late may have been used in the earlier time, though they did not find their way into the literature that has come down to us. We are also not unmindful of the fact that we have occasionally spoken of words as late that appear once or twice in the early literature. However, the occurrence of a word in the Song of Deborah or the Blessing of Jacob, and certain other noteworthy poems, is not evidence of its early use, for that poetry was probably itself late. Nor have we been willing to consider a word as necessarily pre-exilic that appears frequently in the Psalms, the Proverbs, and Job, though it be occasionally found in prophets that we have been wont to regard as belonging to the eighth century. Still we would not attempt to make too much of the linguistic part of our argument. It has its place and is important; but there are other things that cannot be

⁵⁶ שִׁמְעוּ אֶת־הַדְּבָר הַזֶּה, 3:1; with these words the three parts of this section begin. The phrase is as evident a mark of the purely literary character of the work as the set phrases and formulæ of the oracles of the first part of Amos, or of the concluding section, are of their respective parts. Such words can hardly be taken as introductory to discourses of which the prophet gives a summary. Cf. Num. 12:6; 16:8, and Gen. 49:2; see also its frequent use in the literary prophets, as in Jer. 2:4; 7:2; 10:1. מִשְׁפָּחָה, as here used for the whole people, is late; see Mic. 2:3 and Jer. 8:3. רַק אַתֶּם יִדְעֵתִי, 3:2, is found in Hos. 13:5 and other late passages substantially as here. אֶפְקֹד עֲלֵיכֶם אֶת כָּל־עֲוֹנוֹתֵיכֶם, is a late theological conception. We have in 3:3-8 such reasoning from cause to effect as is characteristic of the late literature, Proverbs, Deutero-Isaiah, etc. It is entirely out of place in a pre-exilic book. שָׁאֵן, 3:4, appears to be late; we have it in 1:2, an admittedly post-exilic passage. מַעֲוָה and מַעֲוָה find no mention earlier than Deuteronomy. פֶּחַ, 3:5, is late; not earlier than Josh. 23:13 (D). אֶת־תְּהוֹמֵהּ רָעָה בַּעֲרֵי וַיְהוּה לֹא עָשָׂה, 3:6, reveals to us the thought of Yahweh as the author of evil; cf. Deutero-Isa. 45:7. סֹדֶר, 3:7, is not old, though found in Gen. 49:6; סֹתֵר appears to have been the old word for hidden thing or secret. עֲבָדְרִי הַנְּבִיאִים, is a late phrase; cf. Ezek. 38:17. עָשָׂק, 3:9, as a verb is not early; the word as used here is even later. אָצֵר and שָׂד, 3:10, are late. כִּרְעִים, 3:12, appears nowhere in the early literature. בָּדֵל, 3:12, is also late. Other terms for piece or portion appear to be earlier; see חֶלֶק, פֶּלֶא, and יֵתֶר. פֶּאֶה is late; and עָרַשׁ, of the same verse, is not used earlier than Deuteronomy. בֵּית יַעֲקֹב, 3:13, is a late phrase. אֲדַנִּי יְהוּה אֱלֹהֵי הַצְּבָאוֹת is late: it is found substantially as here in Amos 4:13; 5:14, 15, and 9:5, all of which are admittedly post-exilic. קִרְנוֹת הַמִּזְבֵּחַ, 3:14, is late, as in Exod. 27:2, etc. (P). While Cheyne rejects this phrase as post-exilic, it is generally accepted as an integral part of Amos, as indeed it is. בֵּית וּבֵית הַתֹּרֶה, is late; cf. Jer. 36:22. See for both Driver, "Joel and Amos" (*Cambridge Bible*), p. 163. שֵׁן for ivory is late; see Cant. 5:14. In 4:1 אֲבִיבִין is late as used; cf. Psalms and Proverbs. Chap. 4:11 should be compared with Deut. 29:23 (22). אֹרֶךְ, is not earlier than the prophets. קִינָה, 5:1, is found in 2 Sam. 1:17; elsewhere it is late, if not there; cf. Amos 8:10; Ezek. 2:10; 2 Chron. 35:25, etc. בְּחֹלֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל, 5:2, is late; cf. 2 Kings 19:21; Isa. 37:22, etc. בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל, 5:3, is late; cf. Exod. 40:38 (P); Lev. 10:6 (P); Josh. 21:45 (43) (D or P). Ezekiel seems to have had a great fondness for the term, if he did not coin it. דְּרָשׁוֹנִי וַחֲוִי, 5:4; cf. Jer. 29:13; 2 Chron. 15:2, and Isa. 55:3. אֹרֶךְ, 5:5, should be compared with Hos. 4:15; 5:8; 10:5. Beth-awen was a late prophetic term of

safely ignored, as, for example, the general post-exilic tone of the passages of the supposedly original parts of Amos, and their correspondence with acknowledged post-exilic insertions. It is just here that the book of Amos as a whole makes its impression. It is not merely that the linguistic and other evidence for its late date multiplies at every step; it is the general character and tone of the work that carry conviction when once all presuppositions are thrown aside and the title and biographical section are rejected as untrustworthy. Just here Dr. Taylor, in *Hastings's Dictionary of the Bible* (Vol. I, p. 87), probably voices the convictions of most students of Amos who feel compelled to regard the book as pre-exilic: "In so early a writer as Amos it is surprising to meet with so few signs of sympathy with the modes of thought and expression which were afterward abandoned by the higher religion of the Old Testament." Such students as Dr. Taylor have to admit that in its general tone, its style, and its thought, Amos is post- rather than pre-exilic. Their presuppositions compel them to put Amos, as a piece of literature, where it does not belong. Our conclusions leave place for no such difficulties as those with which they find themselves face to face.

Viewed as we regard it Amos is, like Jonah, a late prophetic book written with a motive that is easily discernible in its main outlines. After the return from the exile, partial as that return was, there was for a long time a disposition on the part of the reformers in Jerusalem to look upon north Israel, or Ephraim,

reproach for Bethel. **בֵּית יוֹסֵף**, 5:6, as a name for north Israel is late, Obad. 18; Zech. 10:6. **לִעֲנָה**, 5:7, is not earlier than Deuteronomy (29:18 [17]); see also Jer. 9:15 (14); Prov. 5:4. **מִשְׁפַּט וְצִדְקָה**, 5:7, is a late phrase. **תַּעֲב**, 5:10, is not earlier than Deuteronomy. It is common in the Psalms and Job. **בִּשְׁס**, 5:11, should probably be **בִּוּס**, which is not earlier than Ezek. 16:6. **אֶכֶר**, 5:16, is late. **דְּרִיר**, 5:18, is characteristic of oracular prophecy. It is found nowhere in the early literature. **יּוֹם יְהוּה**, 5:18, is, like all kindred phrases, late. It is characteristic of Joel, upon whom Amos depends. **אֶפֶל**, 5:20, is especially characteristic of the Psalms and Job. **נִגָּה**, of the same verse, is also late. **עֲצֻרָת**, 5:21, is not earlier than Deut. 16:8. **קָהַל** is the earlier word for assembly. **זִמְרָה**, 5:23, is late, though the verb is found in the earlier literature. **אִתָּחַן**, 5:24, is used nowhere, save here and in the Psalms, of a river; see Ps. 74:15. **הַיּוֹרֵשׁ אֲנִי בְצִיר**, 6:1, is characteristic of the late time. **נִקְבִי רֹאשִׁית הַגִּוִּים** is late. **נִדָּה**, 6:3, is late; cf. Isa. 66:5. **סָרַח**, 6:4, is late; cf. Jer. 49:7, a post-exilic passage. The custom of reclining upon couches came in after the exile. **כָּר**, of the same verse, is late; cf. 1 Sam. 15:9 (Late E). In 6:5 is a late tradition concerning David. **חֲשֵׁב**, as here used, is late; cf. 2 Chron. 26:15. **כִּי שִׁיר** should be compared with equivalent phrases found in the post-exilic literature, as Neh. 12:36. **מִזְרֹק**, 6:6, is late; cf. Jer. 52:18, 19; Zech. 9:15, etc. **שְׁמִינִים**, 6:6, here and in other post-exilic literature as "unguents;" in the early literature in singular as "oil." **שִׁבְר**, of the same verse, in the sense of "affliction," is late. It suggests social conditions which were not known in 780 B. C. **גִּאֲוֹן יַעֲקֹב**, 6:8, is a late phrase; cf. Ps. 47:4 (5) and Nahum 2:2 (3). **רֹאשׁ**, "poppy," 6:12, is not earlier than Deut. 29:18 (17); cf. Job 20:16 and Ps. 69:21 (22), etc. It was a kind of poison, probably extracted from the head of the poppy.

with disfavor, because of the state of affairs there, both civically and religiously. The Assyrian captivity, or dispersion, had been but partial. Against north Israel, then, this post-exilic writer thundered, albeit not to the total neglect of Judah and neighboring peoples by any means ; but he did, for reasons known only to himself, put his words in the mouth of one whom he supposed to have lived in the days of Jeroboam II. In an imperfect way only does he reproduce the past ; the coloring is largely that of his own day ; in little more than in the osseous structure of his work does he give us a pre-exilic book. The only wonder is that his fiction should have so long misled us. But perhaps this is no stranger than the present state of our minds concerning Hosea, Micah, Isaiah, Jeremiah, etc., all of which books need to be re-examined in the light which our knowledge of the life of the people subsequent to the exile throws upon these prophetic pieces.⁵⁷

In conclusion, we may say that the book of Amos is substantially a unity, the only doubtful parts being certain small portions which have the appearance of being editorial notes and glosses, some of which found their way into the text in the attempt to fill up its "holes," of which there are remarkably few as compared with Hosea. As to the date of Amos, we cannot pretend to fix it with any degree of accuracy. The book probably belongs to a time considerably subsequent to the exile. It appears to be later than Joel. If we can bring students of the Old Testament to put it where we are convinced it belongs, in the post-exilic time, we are for the present content. Others of the early literary prophets need to be more carefully examined before we can arrive at exactitude as to the date of Amos. The whole great question as to oracular prophecy should be regarded as fearlessly as many of us have handled the Psalms. So treating the prophetic literature, we may be forced to conclusions widely at variance with our opinions hitherto held ; but to conclusions in accordance with facts ; and such conclusions are the only ones worthy of us as reverent and indefatigable students of the life and thought of Israel.

⁵⁷ The state of the text of Jeremiah and its manifest want of orderly arrangement lead the writers to regard it suspiciously. Probably, like Isaiah, it is a post-exilic thesaurus of Jewish prophecy, though on the whole much later. Micah we leave to one side for the present, though it must eventually be placed somewhere near the time assigned to parts of Isaiah. Of Hosea we may speak more confidently. It is post-exilic, and is aimed at the foreign phobia of the writer's day, as it is also at those dispersed Jews who would not turn from their wealth and easy-going manner of life for a harder but holier life at home.